

Attorney Docket No. 10559-230001
Serial No.: 09/675,279
Amendment dated December 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action dated September 17, 2003

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

The drawings stand objected to as referring to the reference character 16 as two different things. In response, page 3, line 15 has been amended to clarify that the data is sent to a communication channel.

The drawings further stand objected to as not including figures 8b and 9. Copies of these figures are attached. No new matter is entered since these figures show only that which is described in the specification.

Claims 1-13, 16, 19, 21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 be as allegedly being anticipated by Li. The remaining claims stand rejected as being obvious over Li in view of the Li article. In response, all of the claims are amended to better emphasize their patentable distinctions. As amended, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the subject matter of specifying bandwidths for the layer that are used, and forming multiple layers of enhancement data, where each of the multiple

Attorney Docket No. 10559-230001
Serial No.: 09/675,279
Amendment dated December 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action dated September 17, 2003

layers has the respective specified bandwidth. This completely distinguishes over the bit plane technique which was used in the prior art, and it is also used in Li. In Li, whatever is left over after the initial image has been formed is bit plane coded (see generally column 6 beginning at line 58). Bit plane coding codes the residual PCT coefficients as a number of bits instead of a decimal integer. As explained in column 7, beginning at line 59, this produces different planes, where the planes for the different significant bits have different bandwidths.

For example, the most significant bit plane has a different number of ones than the third most significant bit plane. When these bit planes are converted into run length symbols, therefore, the third most significant bit plane has more symbols than the most significant bit plane (see column 8, lines 1-7). In this way, the different enhancement bit planes have bandwidths which depend on the image itself; not on the specified bandwidth. In fact, there is no way using the bit plane system to specify bandwidths for the multiple layers and then to form multiple layers having those specified bandwidths.

Li teaches this bit plane system, which is completely different from the claimed system. Therefore, claim 1 should be allowable along with the claims that depend therefrom.

Attorney Docket No. 10559-230001
Serial No.: 09/675,279
Amendment dated December 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action dated September 17, 2003

Claims 31 and 32 have also been added to depend from claim 1. Claim 31 specifies that a single bandwidth is used for each of the multiple layers. As explained above, the bit plane technique is not capable of use for a single bandwidth for each of the multiple layers. Therefore, claim 31 is even further distinguishable thereover.

Claim 32 specifies that the single bandwidth is effected by forming layers which have similar numbers of substantially the same number of digital ones. This has the effect of producing the bandwidth consistency as described above.

Claim 4 should be allowable for similar reasons along with the claims which depend therefrom.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite that each of the layers has substantially equal bandwidth. This is not possible using the bit plane technique, and therefore should be allowable for similar reasons to those discussed above.

Claim 13 has been amended to specify the technique of thresholding, which is completely different than the bit plane technique described in 531. Therefore, claim 13 should be allowable along with the claims which depend therefrom. Claim 16 should be allowable for similar reasons.

Attorney Docket No. 10559-230001
Serial No.: 09/675,279
Amendment dated December 17, 2003
Reply to Office Action dated September 17, 2003

Claim 19 has been amended to specify a specified bandwidth requirement, and should be allowable for similar reasons to those discussed above.


Claims 21-30 have been canceled in order to obviate the issues relating thereto.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, all of the claim should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is hence respectfully solicited.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 10/17/03



Scott C. Harris
Attorney for Intel Corporation
Reg. No. 32,030

Fish & Richardson P.C.
PTO Customer Number: 20985
12390 El Camino Real
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: (858) 678-5070
Facsimile: (858) 678-5099
10353397.doc

Best Available Copy